

# RESOLVE

## MEMORANDUM

October 2, 1997

1255 23rd Street NW

Suite 275

Washington DC 20037

202.344.2300 phone

202.338.1264 fax

7.4  
10/2/97  
✓

**TO:** Ms. Noemi Emeric, Project Officer  
Mr. John Tielsch, Delivery Order Project Officer

**FROM:** Marci DuPraw, Senior Mediator, RESOLVE

**SUBJECT:** Draft Convening Report

Attached please find RESOLVE's draft convening report for the National Lead/Taracorp Superfund site under Delivery Order 149 (Contract 68-W4-0001). In short, it appears that the affected parties differ regarding the need for an ongoing community forum related to site remediation, with some strongly in favor of establishing such a forum and others seeing no need for one and/or potential harm ensuing.

There does appear to be a need for expanded communication about clean-up with affected parties, and in the attached report, we have discussed two alternative paths: (1) a community advisory group (CAG); and (2) a combination of more frequent, albeit ad hoc, community meetings and written communication.

We identified two significant obstacles to the establishment of a CAG. Some of the principals involved in site-related litigation are concerned that a CAG could interfere with litigation-related negotiations. In addition, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is reluctant to endorse a CAG focusing on site remediation. These issues are significant, and we would be glad to discuss them further with you by telephone.

The Delivery Order asked for a budget for the process envisioned, presumably for aspects requiring a subcontractor's support. If EPA is able to accommodate the community requests contained herein, I believe RESOLVE could be of most help in a transitional role during the period in which EPA launches implementation; this role might involve coaching and/or facilitation of one or two meetings. RESOLVE anticipates that this limited role could be supported by the existing budget for this delivery order based on the following assumptions:

- No more than two one-night trips to Chicago or the Granite City area would be needed in addition to the one we have already made;
- Tasks 3 and 4 of RESOLVE's current work plan for this project would be unnecessary and those hours could be re-allocated to RESOLVE's coaching/facilitation role.

As noted, this is a draft report, and I look forward to receiving your feedback. Toward that end, perhaps a conference call would be fruitful. Please give me a call when

EPA Region 5 Records Ctr.



257679

you have had a chance to review the attached report, and we can discuss how best to finalize the report. As you know, I can be reached at (202) 965-6214.

**NATIONAL LEAD INDUSTRIES/TARACORP SUPERFUND SITE**  
**Recommendations Regarding the Utility of a Community Advisory Group**

Delivery Order 149  
Contract No. 68-W4-0001

Submitted by RESOLVE, Inc.  
October, 1997

**NATIONAL LEAD INDUSTRIES/TARACORP SUPERFUND SITE:**

**Recommendations Regarding the Utility of a Community Advisory Group**

**- TABLE OF CONTENTS -**

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	
<b>I.</b>	<b>SITE BACKGROUND ..... 1</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT EFFORT TO DATE ..... 2</b>
<b>III.</b>	<b>ASSESSING THE UTILITY OF A COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP ... 3</b>
<b>A.</b>	<b>Approach ..... 3</b>
<b>B.</b>	<b>Findings ..... 4</b>
<b>C.</b>	<b>Recommendations .....13</b>
<b>III.</b>	<b>CONCLUSION .....18</b>
<b>Appendix A: Interviewees</b>	
<b>Appendix B: Interview Questions</b>	
<b>Appendix C: Suggested Scope of CAG Discussions</b>	

**NATIONAL LEAD INDUSTRIES/TARACORP SUPERFUND SITE:  
Recommendations Regarding the Utility of a Community Advisory Group**

**- EXECUTIVE SUMMARY -**

In April, 1997, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) issued a delivery order to RESOLVE, a non-profit facilitation organization located in Washington, D.C. to obtain assistance in determining whether it would be helpful to establish an ongoing community forum on the clean-up of the NL/Taracorp Superfund site in Granite City, Illinois. In undertaking this task, RESOLVE reviewed pertinent site-related documents, interviewed three EPA project staff, and then interviewed thirteen residents and officials of the four communities affected by site contaminants (Granite City, Madison, Venice, and Eagle Park Acres). We asked interviewees whether or not they thought a forum such as a community advisory group (CAG) would be helpful and if so, who should be on it, what topics it should address, and how the forum should be structured.

We did find a need for expanded communication between EPA and affected communities, but we encountered a variety of opinions on the usefulness of a CAG as the way in which to do this. In each of the four communities, at least one person was strongly in favor of establishing a CAG and at least one person saw no need for it. We also found that some of the principals involved in site-related litigation are concerned that establishing a CAG prior to resolution of that case might jeopardize settlement negotiations. In addition, we found that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, which is managing the clean up for EPA, is reluctant to endorse the idea of a CAG.

We believe that EPA could fulfill affected communities' information needs through either a CAG or expanded use of ad hoc community meetings. Interview responses, taken as a whole, did not clearly point to one vs. another. Thus, RESOLVE has laid out the advantages and disadvantages of each; if EPA chooses to establish a CAG, we recommend that EPA delay doing so until site-related litigation has been resolved and until EPA can elicit support for the idea from the project lead for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Meanwhile, we suggest that EPA hold a community meeting within the next 6-8 weeks to update the community on remediation progress, discuss RESOLVE's findings, and ask those in attendance to weigh in on their preferred vehicle for communicating with EPA. The list of issues warranting discussion between EPA and community members based on RESOLVE's research can be found in Appendix C.

RESOLVE outlined a suggested structure for a CAG in the event that the above conditions are met and EPA wishes to establish a CAG. RESOLVE provided the names of 10 specific individuals who might be good candidates for CAG membership (two in Granite City, four in Venice, three in Eagle Park Acres, and one in Madison), but recommended that EPA remain flexible about adding CAG members as appropriate. In particular, we suggested that one or more additional individuals be added to represent

Granite City government, with specific individuals to be chosen in consultation with Mayor Selph once site-related litigation has been resolved. We also suggested that additional representation from Madison may be appropriate, and noted that Mayor Hamm is exploring the extent of interest in his community.

We recommended that all CAG meetings be open to the public, and that each meeting agenda offer an opportunity for members of the public to ask questions. We suggested that the CAG meet at least quarterly -- more often if site-related activities warrant it -- and that meetings take place between 6:00 and 8:00 PM on a weekday other than Tuesday.

We suggested that EPA initially take leadership responsibility for launching the CAG, but that EPA should look for ways to share leadership with one or more local individuals from the outset and perhaps ultimately transfer leadership completely to a local person or team. In the near term, we suggested that EPA convene a steering committee with one member from each of the four communities to assist in the development of agendas, securing appropriate meeting facilities, and publicizing CAG meetings in their respective communities. We suggested that the location of CAG meetings rotate from one community to another, and proposed a few possible ground rules to encourage constructive discussion.

## **NATIONAL LEAD INDUSTRIES/TARACORP SUPERFUND SITE:**

### **Recommendations Regarding the Utility of a Community Advisory Group**

RESOLVE, Inc.

October, 1997

**I. SITE BACKGROUND:** The National Lead Industries/Taracorp Superfund Site, included on the National Priorities List in 1986, is a 16-acre site at 16th Street and Cleveland Boulevard in Granite City, IL. Lead contaminants from this site affect a 55-square block area that includes parts of three adjacent communities (Madison, Venice, and Eagle Park Acres) in addition to Granite City.

The industrial history of the site dates back to 1903, when Hoyt Metal conducted metal refining and fabricating processes at this location. Sometime during the next 25 years, it was sold and renamed United Lead. National Lead (NL) Industries owned the facility from 1928 to 1979, when it sold the operation to Taracorp, Inc., a metal manufacturing company. Operations between 1903 and 1979 also included a secondary lead smelter for purifying and reprocessing scrap and used batteries containing lead.

Routes of potential human exposure to contaminants from this site include breathing airborne lead dust, skin contact with soils containing lead, and ingestion of such soils through eating contaminated foods or by hand-to-mouth contact. Groundwater contamination was discovered in 1993, but the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is unaware of anyone using this groundwater for drinking water.

The Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study, conducted by NL Industries between 1987 and 1990 under a voluntary consent order, broke the site down into three units for analysis: (1) the main industrial area; (2) adjacent residential areas; and (3) remote fill areas. For purposes of this document, each of these areas warrants a bit more description since each is associated with a different set of communities and is at a different stage of clean-up.

- **The Main Industrial Area:** A 3.5-acre area that formerly encompassed: (a) the NL Industries/Taracorp lead smelting facility; (b) a slag pile recycling operation owned previously by St. Louis Lead Recyclers (SLLR) and now by Trust 454; (c) BV&G Transport, a trucking company; and (d) the Rich Oil fuel oil distributor. The first two of these businesses (NL Industries/Taracorp and SLLR) left behind two lead-containing waste piles together totaling 91,000 cubic yards. This is also the area in which EPA has recently discovered groundwater contamination due to contaminants leaching from the piles. EPA's proposed remedy for this area focuses on capping the waste piles.
- **Adjacent Residential Areas:** A number of different locations in Granite City, Venice, and Madison neighborhoods where soils contain dangerous levels of lead from airborne dust originating at the lead smelter. Together, these areas of contaminated residential soils total about 500 acres, with those areas closest to the site showing the highest levels of lead contamination. EPA's remedy for these areas consists of excavating highly contaminated

soils (those with lead levels in excess of 500 parts per million (ppm), disposing of them in an off-site landfill, and restoring landowners' landscaping to a condition as close as possible to its original state.

- **Remote Fill Areas:** A total of about 80 locations throughout the area where battery case materials containing lead were used for fill and paving in low-lying areas. EPA's remedy for these areas entails excavating lead fill and paving material, disposing of it in an off-site landfill, and replacing it with conventional paving materials.

**Stage of Clean-up:** EPA has not yet begun to remediate the main industrial area; the proposed remedy is currently subject to litigation, although settlement negotiations are underway. However, work is well underway on the residential and remote fill areas under the direction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The Corps reports that it has completed clean-up of all highly contaminated sections of Eagle Park, and is almost done with the 2-block section of Venice that was affected. The Corps' remaining focus is on Granite City and Madison. Of 1,300 yards that were contaminated, the Corps has now cleaned up between 300 and 400 yards. Granite City officials and some homeowners have denied the Corps access to some of the contaminated properties; a recent judicial decision has to some extent removed this obstacle to remediation, although access is still problematic in some cases. The Corps expects to complete its work within two years.

**II. COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT EFFORTS TO DATE:** The U.S. EPA published a community involvement plan for this site in June, 1989, based on a round of interviews with residents and local officials conducted in October, 1988. The objectives enumerated in this plan focus on informing the community about the site and about the Superfund remedial process. Toward this end, EPA designated a contact person for the site and established an information repository at the Granite City Public Library. In addition, EPA planned to undertake the following activities:

- Meetings upon request with local officials and residents, to be conducted jointly by EPA's remedial project manager and community relations coordinator at the Granite City Hall;
- Press releases and fact sheets;
- Update reports when new information becomes available; and
- Publish notice of EPA's proposed remedial plan, followed by a public meeting, a public comment period, and a "responsiveness summary" (a document that responds to each comment made during the public comment period).

Over the years, EPA has in fact held a number of public meetings and issued fact sheets for site-related milestones such as the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study, Record of Decision, and promulgation of an Explanation of Significant Difference. Agency staff have held availability sessions and made home visits. In particular, staff have had extensive contact with homeowners to gain access to their property for clean-up purposes. EPA has found most

homeowners to be receptive to requests for access. However, a few homeowners have denied EPA access to their properties, and Granite City itself has denied EPA access to the city-owned rights-of-way between the street and sidewalk. Granite City has opposed EPA's remedial plan in court; settlement negotiations are currently underway.

There have been no public meetings connected with this site in the past year. EPA staff considers the 1989 community relations plan outdated, and anticipate revising it in the near future. It is in this context that EPA is considering the establishment of an ongoing communication forum related to the site, such as a community advisory group (CAG), and has asked RESOLVE to assist the agency in determining whether this would meet the felt needs of the affected communities.

RESOLVE is an independent environmental dispute resolution organization based in Washington, DC. In early 1997, EPA asked RESOLVE to review community involvement needs and make recommendations about how to meet them. RESOLVE's review focused on interviews with residents and local officials from affected communities. Although RESOLVE was contacted by EPA to conduct this assessment, it approached the task as an impartial evaluator, consistent with its contract for neutral services with EPA.

RESOLVE interviews included a question about the interviewee's role with respect to the site to date; in this context, most respondents mentioned that they had attended one or more meetings related to the site over the past few years. One person mentioned that there had been one or more separate meetings for mayors and township supervisors separate from general community meetings (and seemed to feel this was appropriate). Many respondents expressed satisfaction with EPA's communications to date. In fact, one person who differs with EPA on substantive issues nevertheless complemented EPA staff on the way in which they had run public meetings related to the site (e.g., observing, for example, that EPA staff were well-informed, able to answer questions, use graphics and handouts, etc.).

### **III. ASSESSING THE UTILITY OF A COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP**

**A. Approach.** RESOLVE staff based the recommendations that are the focus of this report on 13 telephone interviews with residents and civic leaders in the communities affected by the NL/Taracorp site, as well as on 5 additional interviews with members of pertinent state and federal agencies, and analysis of site-related documents. A complete list of interviewees can be found in Appendix A, and the interview questions in Appendix B.

To develop its list of community interviewees, RESOLVE began with a few names provided by EPA project staff. As RESOLVE interviewed these individuals, the interviewer asked each person who else RESOLVE should be in touch with. RESOLVE pursued virtually every suggestion offered.

RESOLVE's lead staff member on this project, Marci DuPraw, visited the site and surrounding communities in August 1997, to get oriented and to introduce herself to local government entities in each community. These visits also afforded her an opportunity to elicit suggestions for potential interviewees. Additional names were drawn from EPA's community involvement plan for the site.

RESOLVE sought to contact individuals representing the range of views about the NL/Taracorp site, and an approximately equal number of interviewees in each community. The fact that the resulting interviews range from two to six per community reflects: (a) difficulty RESOLVE encountered in eliciting suggestions for interview candidates in those communities with fewer interviews; and (b) difficulty in reaching those individuals whose names were put forth, despite persistent effort.

It should also be noted that the jurisdictions of those communities with only two or three interviews seem to overlap with one another in ways that suggest the distinctions between Venice, Madison, and Eagle Park Acres may be somewhat artificial. For example, Venice Township Supervisor Andy Economy has jurisdiction over Eagle Park Acres and has offices in Madison. In addition, some Eagle Park Acres students attend school in Venice and some in Madison.

## **B. Findings**

### **1. Utility of A Community Advisory Group.**

- **Need for Expanded Communication Affirmed.** Whether or not a CAG *per se* is the answer, there does seem to be a need for stepped-up communication with the community. While (as mentioned above) many respondents expressed satisfaction with EPA's past communications efforts, many of those same individuals asked the RESOLVE interviewer questions that reflected an incomplete picture of progress at the site. Such questions included, for example, what remedy has been selected for the slag pile, whether the site affects Venice schools, and what specific sections of Madison are affected by the site.

One respondent had a much more negative assessment of past community meetings. This person felt that EPA staff had: (a) conveyed inaccurate information to attendees; (b) dominated the meeting time with presentations rather than engaging in dialogue with attendees; (c) neglected to accept public comment until the end of the evening meeting; and (d) when public comment was accepted, failed to recognize speakers in the order in which they had signed up.

- **Differing Opinions About Utility of a CAG.** In assessing the value of establishing a community advisory group for the NL/Taracorp site, RESOLVE encountered an *overall* pattern of ambivalence (although most individuals had a clear opinion one way or another). Within each of the affected communities, there was at least one voice saying, "Great idea - wish it had been done long ago!" and at least one saying, "I see no need for it."

A few people were somewhat on the fence about the value of a CAG. Of these, two said it would be valuable if it were, in effect, a powerful forum. More specifically, one said it would be a good idea if the CAG involved people who can make a difference (e.g., EPA staff); the other said a CAG would be valuable if it went beyond a "feel good" exercise. Two other individuals said that establishing a CAG now might jeopardize settlement negotiations; of these two, one suggested revisiting the idea once litigation has been

resolved and both said that if others wanted to proceed with a CAG (once the litigation has been resolved), they would not find this objectionable.

At least one leader each in Venice and Madison said there is little interest in the remediation process in those communities, but one of these two individuals still was enthusiastic about the idea of a CAG. One of those individuals noted that he is seeing initial hostilities toward the clean-up process recede as residents observe good results for those homes whose yards have now been remediated.

The Army Corps of Engineers, which is managing remediation in the field, opposes the concept of establishing a CAG that focuses on clean-up activities unless it in some way assisted the Corps in getting permission to clean up yards to which the Corps had previously been denied access. While the Corps representative could support a CAG focusing on the problem of lead contamination due to exposure to lead-based paints, his views of a CAG focusing on site remediation are as follows:

- (a) The Corps is handling community relations and is doing so in a satisfactory manner;
- (b) There are no technical issues involved in the clean-up that would be amenable to discussion in a CAG-like forum;
- (c) A CAG would not afford a constructive forum for communication; and
- (d) A CAG could potentially interfere with the progress of clean up.

Due to the central role of the Corps in the clean-up process and interviewees' related desire to have a Corp representative participate in CAG meetings if such a body were convened (discussed below), the Corps' objections to establishing a CAG focusing on site remediation must be given very careful consideration.

## 2. Potential Members of a CAG.

Some interviewees offered general advice about the kinds of people to seek as members in the event that EPA decides to convene a CAG, and others offered specific names. General advice was as follows:

- Include a mix of residents and civic leaders,
- Include both homeowners and renters;
- For each affected community, include local professionals, school district officials, community-oriented individuals, churches, and non-profit organizations; and
- Include the clean-up professionals (e.g., from the EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers).

Individual names suggested included:

In Granite City:

- Ms. Alice Maxey, Granite City resident
- Mr. Warren Leimer, Granite City resident
- Ms. Stephanie Tinker, Granite City resident
- Mr. Paul Wilson, Granite City resident
- Mr. Dewey Melton, Madison County Board of Education and former Granite City mayoral candidate
- Ms. Norma Asadorian, Granite City resident
- Mr. Mike Patton, Granite City alderman candidate
- Ms. Pam Asadorian, Granite City resident
- Alderman Craig Tarpoff
- Alderman Ed Asadorian
- Precinct Committeeman Art Asadorian

In Venice:

- The Honorable Tyrone Echols, Mayor of Venice
- Mr. John Rush, Venice School Superintendent
- Ms. Lizzie Townsend, PTA President and Venice Resident
- Reverend Williams, Pastor, New Shining Light Baptist Church and former Venice City Council member
- Alderman John Ervin
- Will Glasper, Venice Resident
- James Harrell, Venice Resident
- Sandra Harris, Venice Resident

In Eagle Park Acres:

- Mr. Eddie Salmond, Eagle Park Action Committee
- Mr. Larrick Arnold, President, Eagle Park Improvement Association
- Mr. Andy Economy, Eagle Park Township Supervisor

In Madison:

- The Honorable John Hamm, Mayor of Madison

Federal Agency Representatives:

- Tom Bloodworth (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers)
- Brad Bradley (U.S. EPA)

There was some difference of opinion as to the extent to which elected officials should be included on the CAG. One person felt strongly that if a CAG is convened, all CAG members should consist of elected officials to ensure accountability to the community. Others would prefer to see more direct participation by affected residents, and some warned to avoid "fili-

busters." Community members suggested that if EPA establishes a CAG, it would be important to inform Congressman Costello and State Representative Thomas Holbrook about the effort, but that it would probably be unnecessary to interview them.

A number of people believed there should be a representative of Granite City on the CAG, but there were a range of ideas about who the most appropriate representative should be, including Alderman Craig Tarpoff, Alderman Eddie Asadorian, and Precinct Committeeman Art Asadorian.

Two mayors of affected jurisdictions offered to explore the subject of membership candidates with their respective City Councils, but RESOLVE has not yet heard back from them.

Other suggestions relevant to CAG participation included the recommendation that: (1) CAG meetings be covered by the local community access television channel; and (2) EPA hold general public meetings in addition to CAG meetings to broaden opportunities for community participation in dialogues about site remediation.

2. Potential Issues for Discussion. In considering the possibility of establishing a CAG for this site, EPA staff anticipated that such a forum might afford an opportunity for focused and extended dialogue with community members about the following list of topics:

- Types of assistance EPA can provide to the affected communities
- The types and amounts of contaminants in individual yards
- Job opportunities associated with clean-up of the site
- The best vehicles for communicating with affected parties
- How to complete clean-up as soon as possible while meeting everyone's needs as much as possible (e.g., minimizing impact, maximizing satisfaction, and minimizing disruption)
- The remediation timeline, and why clean-up activities stop and start when they do
- How to allocate funds that may become available for lead-based paint clean-up activities
- How best to protect children and young adults during the clean-up
- How best to protect property values
- How to clean up contaminated dust inside homes

EPA staff also suggested that they could conduct a brief training, "This is Superfund," for CAG members early on to orient participants to the remediation process.

There was considerable overlap between EPA staff's ideas about potential discussion topics and those of community interviewees who were interested in a CAG. Suggestions offered during interviews included:

Information Exchange About:

- What parts of each community are contaminated and with what
- EPA's remediation plans for the slag piles (e.g., to cap or not; where to dispose of the waste)

- The remediation timeline, and why clean-up crews come and go when they do
- Local employment opportunities associated with remediation activities
- What precautions EPA and the Corps are taking during the remediation to protect the community and natural resources from further contamination
- What steps residents can take to protect children and young adults during the remediation
- Who is paying for the clean-up (to dispel misconceptions)
- How to get into the lead clean-up program now if a resident had earlier elected not to participate
- Reasons for variations in depth of soil removal from one home to the next
- Contamination from lead-based paints

Problem-Solving About:

- Landscaping procedures (e.g., when sod is being replaced)
- Related norms for communication between clean-up crews and residents
- Helping residents use HEPA vacuums

Input on Sampling:

- Discussing the possibility of widespread, systematic blood tests of both schoolchildren and adults to determine who has been affected and to what degree
- Gaining access to data (e.g., Granite City sampling results)
- Dialogue about how to interpret sample results
- Input on where to sample within a given yard
- Arranging for samples of interior dust levels and resampling yards after clean-up to ensure quality control

Monitoring:

- Monitoring the work of the clean-up crews to ensure quality control

3. Community Suggestions for Structuring a CAG.

Interviewees had a number of suggestions for structuring a CAG if EPA decides to convene such a body. RESOLVE asked related questions about suitable locations, meeting frequency, best day of the week and time of day for meetings, who would be the best person to run CAG meetings, how agendas should be developed, what ground rules might be helpful, and whether or not technical support might be needed. Their advice was as follows:

- Location. The question of location for CAG meetings had several dimensions to it. As mentioned, four communities are affected by NL/Taracorp site contamination; if a single CAG is established, it will be necessary to find a site that is convenient for members of all four communities. However, this is complicated by the fact that many affected residents are of limited means; thus, the site needs to be within walking distance of public transportation systems.

In addition, several respondents mentioned the significance of jurisdictional boundaries between the different communities involved. One person, for example, said that "we don't go into one another's communities without an invitation," and another person expressed unwillingness to participate in the CAG if representatives from another community were involved.

However, a number of other interviewees felt that a cross-jurisdiction CAG would be constructive, as long as it was clear that each community was represented. One interviewee cautioned against having separate forums for each community, implying that this might make EPA vulnerable to legal charges of segregation.

Interviewees had a plethora of ideas about viable meeting locations, including:

- In Eagle Park Acres – the Eagle Park Improvement Association Hall;
  - In Venice – a recreation center, a senior citizens' center, the city library, a community center, or a school;
  - In Granite City – the Township Building (1900 block of Delmar); a resident's home (Stephanie Tinker volunteered hers);
  - In Madison – the new Madison City Hall (accessible to individuals with disabilities; can accommodate meetings of up to 70 people; is equipped with flip charts); the Madison Middle School cafeteria (accessible to all communities); or the Blair School gym in the Madison School District (more accessible to public transportation); and
  - Cross-jurisdictional suggestions – in a church; in each community's council chambers on a rotating basis.
- 
- Frequency of Meetings. Various interviewees suggested that meetings take place monthly, quarterly, and/or on an ad hoc basis as site-related work warrants.
  - Day of the Week. There was general agreement that weekdays were preferable to weekends. In addition, several people recommended avoiding Tuesdays, since a number of the jurisdiction's city councils meet on Tuesdays.
  - Time of Day. There was general agreement that early evening would be the most desirable time for CAG meetings. Respondents suggested meetings might start between 5:30 and 7:00pm, but should definitely be over by 8:00pm.
  - Who Should Run the Meetings. All respondents seemed to agree that, if a CAG is established, EPA should be involved in running CAG meetings at least at the outset. Some felt that EPA could continue to run them. Other suggestions included:
    - Transitioning to leadership by an affected resident (Stephanie Tinker indicated that she might be willing);
    - Joint leadership by EPA and a community leader (Madison Mayor Hamm indicated that he might be willing, or that one of his alderman might be a good candidate); or

- Joint leadership by EPA and a community leader other than a politician.
- How Should Agendas Be Developed? Interviewees had fewer thoughts about how agendas should be developed. One person noted that the CAG should be kicked off with a letter announcing its formation. Another suggestion was that a steering committee be formed to develop agendas. Someone else suggested that EPA could develop proposed agendas, but take input from CAG members at the outset of each meeting on modifications to the proposed agenda; this person also suggested including time for questions and answers at the end of each meeting.
- Ground Rules. Here, also, respondents had few ideas. One person suggested that ground rules be set by the above-mentioned steering committee. Someone else suggested limiting time for remarks in order to avoid "filibusters."
- Technical Support. Several people thought that CAG members might need some assistance in understanding technical information related to site clean-up. Several said that they thought EPA could probably provide this kind of assistance if it is needed. However, interviewees seemed to feel that it is premature to ascertain the extent to which technical assistance will be needed prior to CAG formation. They suggested EPA stay open to offers for help and flexible about how they respond to requests that may come in.

### C. Recommendations

RESOLVE recommends expanded communications between EPA and affected communities; however, as discussed above, interview responses revealed differing opinions within affected communities as to the value of a CAG. Thus, RESOLVE suggests that EPA consider two alternative ways of accommodating community needs for enhanced communication:

- Formation of a CAG; or
- Increased use of ad hoc community meetings and written materials.

The advantages and disadvantages of each of these options are enumerated on the following page in Table 1.

**TABLE I****Comparison of Community Advisory Group vs. Expanded Use of  
Community Meetings and Written Materials**

	<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Disadvantages</b>
Community Advisory Group	Opportunity for EPA to establish constructive, on-going relationships with community members	More labor-intensive for EPA at least for first year
	More likely to nurture community members' sense of commitment to serve as active conduits of information between EPA and broader community	Does not currently have support of US Army Corps of Engineers nor Granite City officials
Expanded use of ad hoc community meetings and written materials	Opportunity for some community members to enhance their own leadership skills and expand their own network of community relationships	Requires sustained commitment from CAG members. Cultivates stronger community expectations regarding the sustenance of regular, ongoing community relations activities
	Affords both EPA and community members more flexibility about the amount of time to invest in community relations activities	Affords less opportunity for EPA to build local relationships
	Less labor intensive for EPA and community members	Affords community members less opportunity to develop leadership skills
	Less likely to meet with active objections from Granite City officials and US Army Corps of Engineers	Less likely to result in attendees sharing responsibility for information dissemination

Whether it is with the establishment of a CAG in mind or less formal measures such as ad hoc community meetings and written information, RESOLVE does suggest that EPA proceed now with a renewed effort to convey updated site remediation information to

affected communities. It might be helpful to build on the momentum of this round of interviews by holding a community meeting within the next 6-8 weeks to:

- Update the community on progress in remediating the site; and
- Discuss the findings from this report.

If litigation-related negotiations have been concluded by the time of that meeting, EPA could share RESOLVE's sense of the community's ambivalence about establishing a CAG and ask those in attendance to proceed with such an initiative or to expand communication in other ways (e.g., more frequent community meetings, a site-related newsletter, etc.) If litigation-related negotiations are still underway at the time of the next community meeting EPA might want to share this report's findings, discuss ways to expand communication other than a CAG, and offer to discuss the formation of a CAG with the community once negotiations have been concluded.

#### 1. Recommendations Applicable To Both Options:

- Issues List: Regardless of the option selected, the list of issues warranting discussion between EPA and community members based on RESOLVE's research can be found in Appendix C.
- Data Needs: Extrapolating from the issues list in Appendix C, RESOLVE suggests that, whether EPA pursues the establishment of a CAG or some other form of expanded communications with affected communities, it would be helpful to provide information to community members on the following topics:
  - Exactly what parts of each jurisdiction are contaminated, with what, and at what levels (ideally a narrative description would be supported by user-friendly visual aids);
  - A corresponding report on the progress of clean-up efforts, being specific about details such as the distinction between *all* contamination having been cleaned-up vs. all *high-level* contamination having been cleaned up;
  - An update on the remediation plan and timeline. Related questions include: (a) who is paying for remediation; (b) why do crews come and go when they do; (c) why do remediation activities (such as depth of soil removal) vary from home-to-home; (d) how can residents enter the remediation program if they originally declined that option; and (e) are there local job opportunities associated with clean-up?
  - A detailed description, albeit in lay terms, of the approach EPA and the Corps are taking to sampling. For example:
    - Are all residences sampled for contaminants?

- How do the agencies decide where on a particular piece of property to take samples? Is it possible for homeowners to have input into that decision?
- Are community residents being systematically tested to determine who has been affected and to what extent? If not, is it possible to do so?
- Are follow-up samples taken after a given property has been cleaned-up to ensure the effectiveness of remediation? If so, are samples taken both inside and outside the home?
- The results of any sampling efforts that EPA and the Corps are able to share (ideally, the original reports would be available for interested parties, but a brief narrative translation would also be distributed in lay terms and a user-friendly format). Residents are particularly interested in knowing the types and amounts of contaminants in their individual yards; and
- A clear description of the precautions EPA and the Corps are taking during the remediation to protect the community and natural resources from further contamination and of the steps residents themselves can take.

A subset of participants also may wish to use these meetings to learn more about contamination from lead-based paints and the availability of funds for associated clean-up activities. RESOLVE recommends being responsive to such interest to the extent possible; however, it should be recognized that the community involvement recommendations herein are based on an assessment of community concerns about *site-related* contamination and remediation and therefore we are proposing forums that focus on that source of contamination.

- Meeting Number/ Frequency/Day of the Week/Time of Day: RESOLVE suggests that meetings take place at least quarterly, and more frequently if site-related activities warrant it as long as EPA and/or the Army Corps of Engineers is actively remediating the site. Based on interviewees' input, meetings should be scheduled between 6:00 and 8:00 pm on either a Monday, Wednesday, or Thursday evening. If a local partner were able to provide light refreshments between 5:30 and 6:00, it would probably afford a valuable opportunity for informal relationship building as well as help participants concentrate during hours when many people are accustomed to having dinner.
- Meeting Location: Out of respect for each of the jurisdictions affected by this site, RESOLVE suggests that either:
  - The location of meetings rotate from one community to the next; or
  - Meetings take place in a relatively central location easily accessible to public transportation (e.g., the Blair School gym in the Madison School District).
- Ground Rules: We suggest that the following ground rules might help community meetings maintain a constructive tone:

- As this meeting is somewhat brief due to the expressed preferences of interviewees, and at the same time, many people are likely to want to speak, each speaker must be concise to allow others time to speak. On a meeting-by-meeting basis, the meeting leader can institute a time limit on each speaker's comments (e.g., 3 minutes).
- Participants are encouraged to listen carefully to one another in an effort to really understand what each person is trying to say.
- It is okay to disagree, but please try to do so courteously. Personal attacks are unacceptable.

We suggest that EPA frame such ground rules as "proposed" ground rules and allow attendees to suggest modifications or additions in order to nurture group ownership of them. In the section below ("Recommendations Applicable If EPA Wishes to Establish A CAG"), we propose one additional ground rule applicable to CAG operations.

## 2. Recommendations Applicable If EPA Wishes To Establish a CAG:

There are two key issues to address should EPA wish to establish a CAG. The first of these is a potential negative impact on settlement negotiations regarding site-related litigation. RESOLVE heard a clear message from principals involved in site-related litigation with EPA that establishing a CAG prior to resolution of that litigation could jeopardize settlement negotiations.

The second issue is the reluctance of the Army Corps of Engineers to endorse the idea of establishing a CAG focusing on remediation. A number of interviewees mentioned that it would be important that the clean-up professionals participate in the CAG – not necessarily as members, but at least to provide accurate technical information and help CAG members understand that information. In addition, the Corps and its contractors would need to be involved in any meaningful problem-solving efforts around the landscaping and related norms for communication with residents. Thus, the Corps' willingness to participate constructively in CAG discussions would be important to the CAG's success. Thus, RESOLVE would recommend that EPA make its decision about how best to meet the community's information and problem-solving needs in consultation with the Corps' project leader. If EPA chooses to establish a CAG, we recommend that EPA delay doing so until site-related litigation has been resolved and until EPA can elicit support for the idea from the project lead for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Should EPA wish to proceed with a CAG, RESOLVE would suggest the following parameters, subject to refinement by CAG members and EPA concurrence:

- CAG Charge: After listening to EPA staff and community interviewees, RESOLVE suggests that the following charge for a CAG might be responsive to the interests of all those wishing to see a CAG established: "To serve as a constructive forum for dialogue and problem-solving by the U.S. EPA, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and clean-up crews under its

purview, affected residents, and leaders of affected communities about clean-up of the NL/Taracorp Superfund site."

- Proposed Membership: RESOLVE would suggest the following individuals for membership on the CAG:

In Granite City:

- One or more representatives of Granite City government (to be determined in consultation with Granite City Mayor Ron L. Selph once the site-related litigation has been resolved)
- Mr. Warren Leimer, Granite City resident
- Ms. Stephanie Tinker, Granite City resident

In Venice:

- The Honorable Tyrone Echols, Mayor of Venice
- Mr. John Rush, Venice School Superintendent
- Ms. Lizzie Townsend, PTA President and Venice Resident
- Reverend Williams, Pastor, New Shining Light Baptist Church and former Venice City Council member

In Eagle Park Acres:

- Mr. Eddie Salmond, Eagle Park Action Committee
- Mr. Larrick Arnold, President, Eagle Park Improvement Association
- Mr. Andy Economy, Eagle Park Township Supervisor

In Madison:

- The Honorable John Hamm, Mayor of Madison

This is a fairly small, but diverse slate of individuals. We recommend that EPA remain open to adding individuals as appropriate. In particular, Madison seems under-represented. (Madison's Mayor John Hamm is in the process of identifying others who may be interested.) Although none of the interviewees mentioned it, EPA might also want to consider inviting the participation of local health departments, the Illinois Department of Public Health, the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, and a representative potentially responsible party, either on an ongoing basis or as relevant topics appear on CAG agendas.

We suggest that CAG meetings be open to the public, particularly given the desired participation of elected officials. In addition, we suggest that EPA ask CAG members to serve as conduits for the concerns and issues of others in their communities (while not delegating EPA's own responsibility for broad communication and accountability to this body). Members should be asked to attend CAG meetings consistently, and to share information obtained in CAG meetings with others in their communities.

- Leadership and Agenda Development: Most interviewees seemed to look to EPA for CAG leadership, at least initially, since EPA is the driving force and information gatekeeper regarding site clean up. At the same time, a number of people did mention the possibility of

involving community members in some aspect of meeting leadership as well.

Thus, RESOLVE suggests that EPA should provide leadership in launching the CAG, but also look for ways to:

- Share leadership responsibilities and visibility with one or more community members from the outset, at least in symbolic ways; and
- Eventually offer opportunities to shift primary CAG leadership responsibilities to community members as local leadership emerges in the group as long as this can be done in a way that does not cause tensions between the affected communities.

RESOLVE suggests that, from the outset, EPA establish a steering committee consisting of one person from each of the affected communities to assist in the development of agendas, publicizing the meeting to members of their respective communities, and securing appropriate meeting facilities. Possible members might include Ms. Stephanie Tinker of Granite City, Reverend Williams of Venice, Mr. Eddie Salmond of Eagle Park Acres, and an appointee of Mayor John Hamm of Madison. As noted below, RESOLVE suggests rotating the location of meetings from one community to the next. The member of the steering committee in whose community a particular meeting is to take place could co-convene that meeting with EPA.

In addition, RESOLVE affirms the interviewee suggestion that at the outset of each meeting, the meeting leader check with CAG members for requested modifications to the agenda. RESOLVE recommends making each meeting as interactive as possible, but specifically making a point to include time for questions and answers on each meeting agenda. We suggest that both CAG members and members of the general public who may be observing the meeting be invited to ask questions during this time.

- Ground Rules: RESOLVE affirms the interviewee suggestion that, if EPA establishes a CAG, a steering committee should play a key role in formulating ground rules. RESOLVE suggests that this committee propose ground rules, subject to the approval of the CAG. The ground rule RESOLVE suggested under the previous section ("Recommendations Applicable to Both Options") would also be a good starting point for such a committee's consideration. However, for a CAG, we would add one more:
  - Although the CAG is not intended to be a decision-making body, there will be procedural decisions it will have to make pertaining to its own operation. These decisions will be made by consensus.
- Suggested Scope of Discussions: As mentioned above, RESOLVE suggests that the scope of CAG discussions might encompass the combined lists generated by EPA staff and interviewees; a merged version of these two lists can be found in Appendix C. RESOLVE does not perceive a need for a separate workshop or team-building event prior to initiating a CAG. The meeting we suggested above in which EPA would discuss the findings of this

report would also afford an opportunity to describe what a CAG is in more detail and how a CAG typically functions. We believe such a discussion would meet the needs of affected parties.

EPA staff had mentioned to RESOLVE that they could conduct a brief training called, "This is Superfund," for CAG members early on to orient participants to the remediation process. RESOLVE suggests that EPA discuss this option with members of the steering committee we suggest below to determine whether or not to offer it in conjunction with the first meeting. We recommend that it should not take the place of the first CAG, during which it will be particularly important to allow for relationship-building interactions; however, depending on interest levels, this training might take the place of a subsequent meeting or be offered in addition to a regular CAG meeting.

- **Technical Support:** Based on interviewees' responses, RESOLVE suggests that at the CAG's first meeting, EPA outline the kinds of technical assistance available and that the agency strive to be responsive to requests of this sort. In addition, we recommend that all substantive information distributed through the CAG be written in clear, lay language and accompanied by visual illustrations where possible.
- **CAG Structure:** RESOLVE anticipates that members are likely to prefer to conduct all discussions in plenary. However, the differences in the scope and stage of the clean up in various communities could conceivably suggest merit in community-specific work groups at some point in the future if the breadth and depth of community engagement in the clean up should increase.

## **I CONCLUSION**

In conclusion, RESOLVE found quite a wide variety of views in the four communities affected by the NL/Taracorp Superfund site regarding whether or not a CAG would be helpful. We certainly found a need for expanded information exchange, and encountered enough respondents who felt a strong need for a CAG to warrant serious consideration of proceeding with a CAG. However, we also felt the alternative of expanded use of ad hoc community meetings, combined with increased written communication, would be worth considering.

However, both because our sample size is fairly small, we suggest EPA make its decision as to whether to establish a CAG after fuller discussion of this report's findings in a public meeting in the affected communities. We also feel that it would be wise to hold off on establishing a CAG, if that is EPA's preferred option, until site-related litigation has been concluded. Moreover, the support of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers would be quite important to the success of a CAG and is not at this time forthcoming.

RESOLVE has provided process suggestions pertinent to both expanded use of ad hoc community meetings and to the establishment of a CAG. We have provided additional suggestions specifically pertinent to a CAG. We hope that RESOLVE's efforts will assist EPA and affected communities in their efforts to communicate constructively with one another throughout the challenging process of cleaning up the NL/Taracorp Superfund site.

**Appendix A**  
**INTERVIEWEES**

**Appendix A  
INTERVIEWEES**

**Eagle Park Acres (2)**

Mr. Andy Economy  
Township Supervisor  
910 Madison Ave.  
Madison, IL 62060  
(618) 452-1121

Mr. Eddie Salmond  
Eagle Park Action Committee  
P.O. Box 227  
Madison, IL 62060  
(618) 451-6971

**Granite City (6)**

Mr. Ed Fitzhenry, Esquire  
City Attorney  
P.O. Box 735  
Granite City, IL 62040  
(618) 876-8500

Mr. Ralph Abrams  
Abrams Real Estate  
3010 Nameoki Road  
Granite City, IL 62040  
(618) 877-1900

Mr. Craig Tarpoff, Alderman  
P.O. Box 6  
Granite City, IL 62040  
(618) 452-8180

Mr. Paul Wilson, Resident  
1707 Edison  
Granite City, IL 62040  
(618) 452-0434

Mr. Warren Leimer, Resident  
1704 Edison  
Granite City, IL 62040  
(618) 876-4647

Ms. Stephanie Tinker, Resident  
1406 State Street  
Granite City, IL 62040  
(618) 452-2712

**Madison (2)**

The Honorable John Hamm, Mayor  
City of Madison  
615 Madison Ave.  
Madison, IL 62060  
(618) 876-6268

Mr. Tom York, Owner  
Buzz' (local business)  
1224 Madison Avenue  
Madison, IL 62060  
(618) 876-2288

**Venice (3)**

The Honorable Tyrone Echols, Mayor  
City of Venice  
Broadway and Klein  
Venice, IL 62090  
(618) 452-8539 (or 877-3586)

Mr. John Ervin, Alderman  
c/o Lincoln Technical Center  
300 South 4th St.  
Venice, IL 62090  
(618) 874-7792

Mr. John Rush, School Superintendent  
700 Broadway  
Venice, IL 62090  
(618) 451-7953

**State and Federal Agencies (5)**

Ms. Noemi Emeric, Community Involvement Coordinator  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region V

Mr. Brad Bradley, Remedial Project Manager  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region V

Mr. Sean Mulroney, Esquire  
Office of Regional Counsel  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region V

Mr. Tom Bloodworth, Project Manager  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Mr. Dave Webb, Toxicologist  
Illinois Department of Public Health  
22 Kettle River Dr.  
Glen Carbon, IL 62034  
(618) 656-6680

**Others RESOLVE Attempted to Contact**

**Eagle Park Acres (1)**

Mr. Larrick Arnold, President  
Eagle Park Improvement Association  
(618) 451-5153

**Granite City (10)**

Mr. Casmer Skubish, Alderman (Ward 1)  
2701 Lincoln Ave.  
Granite City, IL  
(618) 876-1201

Mr. Nick Pertrillo, Alderman (Ward 3)  
2230 Cleveland  
Granite City, IL 62040  
(618) 876-5556

Mr. Foster Frederick, Alderman (Ward 4)  
2428 Logan  
Granite City, IL 62040  
(618) 876-6102

Ms. Nancy Sanders, Alderwoman (Ward 4)  
3102 Yale Dr.  
Granite City, IL 62040  
(618) 452-5055

Mr. Ed Asadorian, Alderman (Ward 5)  
1610 Poplar  
Granite City, IL 62040  
(618) 451-2611

Mr. Lurton Pulley, Alderman (Ward 5)  
2221 Nevada  
Granite City, IL 62040  
(618) 877-5342

Ms. Kathy Andrea, Resident  
(618) 876-54359

Ms. Alice Maxey, Resident  
(618) 451-1407

Mr. Jim Squires, General Manager  
Granite City Steel  
National Steel Corp.  
20th and State  
Granite City, IL 62060  
(618) 451-3756

Ms. Melissa Potterley  
Downtown Neighborhood Restoration Society  
2158 Delmar Ave.  
Granite City, IL 62040  
(618) 452-2611

Venice (4)

Ms. Annie Townsend, PTA President and Resident  
(618) 877-5986

Mr. Will Glasper  
(618) 451-9549

Ms. Sandra Harris, Resident  
(618) 451-0465

Mr. James Harrell, Resident  
Unlisted

**Appendix B**  
**INTERVIEW QUESTIONS**

## **Appendix B**

### **INTERVIEW QUESTIONS**

1. How have you been involved in clean-up activities to date? If so, in what capacity?
2. Would you find an ongoing community forum, such as a community advisory group, helpful as a way to get information about the clean-up and give EPA input about it?
3. Who would you see being part of that group?
4. What issues would you like to see discussed?
5. Any suggestions about:
  - Location
  - 
  - Frequency of meetings
  - Day of the week
  - Time of day
  - Who should run meetings
  - How agendas should be developed?
  - Ground rules
  - Technical support
6. Any questions for me?
7. What is the best way to reach you?

CONFIDENTIAL

APPENDIX C

## **APPENDIX C**

### **SUGGESTED SCOPE OF CAG DISCUSSIONS**

Appendix C  
**SUGGESTED SCOPE OF CAG DISCUSSIONS**

**RECEIVED**

OCT 08 1997

REMEDIAL RESPONSE SECTION #5

**Information Exchange About:**

- Types of assistance EPA can provide to the affected communities
- The best vehicles for communicating with affected parties
- What parts of each community are contaminated and with what
- The types and amounts of contaminants in individual yards
- EPA's remediation plans for the slag piles (e.g., to cap or not; where to dispose of the waste)
- The remediation timeline, and why clean-up crews come and go when they do
- Local employment opportunities associated with remediation activities
- What precautions EPA and the Corps are taking during the remediation to protect the community and natural resources from further contamination
- What steps residents can take to protect children and young adults during the remediation
- How to clean up contaminated dust inside homes
- Who is paying for the clean-up (to dispel misconceptions)
- How to get into the lead clean-up program now if a resident had earlier elected not to participate
- Reasons for variations in depth of soil removal from one home to the next
- How best to protect property values
- Contamination from lead-based paints

**Problem-Solving About:**

- Landscaping procedures (e.g., when sod is being replaced)
- Related norms for communication between clean-up crews and residents
- Helping residents use HEPA vacuums
- How to allocate funds that may become available for lead-based paint clean-up activities
- How to complete clean-up as soon as possible while meeting everyone's needs as much as possible (e.g., minimizing impact, maximizing satisfaction, and minimizing disruption)

**Input on Sampling:**

- Discussing the possibility of widespread, systematic blood tests of both schoolchildren and adults to determine who has been affected and to what degree
- Gaining access to data (e.g., Granite City sampling results)
- Dialogue about how to interpret sample results
- Input on where to sample within a given yard
- Arranging for samples of interior dust levels and resampling yards after clean-up to ensure quality control

**Monitoring**

- Monitoring the work of the clean-up crews to ensure quality control